

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-20 are presently pending in this case. Claim 11 is amended by the present amendment. As amended Claim 11 is supported at least by the specification at page 9, line 17 to page 10, line 16, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 11 was rejected as including new matter; Claims 11-15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brodsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,489,985, hereinafter “Brodsky”) in view of Tomita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,369,493, hereinafter “Tomita”); and Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita and further in view of Chiba et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20010014543, hereinafter “Chiba”).

With regard to the rejection of Claim 11 as including new matter, it is respectfully submitted that the matter objected to, “superpose an image,” is deleted from Claim 11. Consequently, the rejection of Claim 11 is including new matter is believed to be overcome.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 11 and 20 as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 11 recites in part:

- a supply of objects with prepositioning on their reference surface;
- an object support tray;
- a galvanometric head comprising:
  - a first wide field camera with a focusing lens, with a first filter located at an output from the first camera,
  - a second narrow field camera with a focusing lens, with a second filter located at an output from the second camera,
  - a guide mirror,
  - galvanometric deflection mirrors, and
  - a lens that displays at least one object located on the
- tray;
- a laser source; and

a computer on which a shape recognition software is installed for checking operation of the first camera, the second camera, the laser source, and movement control means for the galvanometric head,

wherein *the computer is configured to determine first location coordinates of an object in an image of the first camera in a first coordinate system, to determine second location coordinates of the object in an image from the second camera in a second coordinate system, and to determine a relationship between the first location coordinates and the second location coordinates.*

Brodsky describes a laser marking system and method.<sup>1</sup> The outstanding Office Action conceded that Brodsky does not teach or suggest “a first wide field camera” and “a second narrow field camera” as recited in Claim 11, and cited Tomita as describing these features.<sup>2</sup> However, it is respectfully submitted that Tomita only describes that *only one* of two imaging devices or cameras may be used.<sup>3</sup> For example, column 9, lines 25-31 of Tomita states “When the position of the electronic component 4 on the nozzle 3 has been observed by *either* the first *or* second imaging apparatuses 6, 43, then the optical component 8 may be moved linearly in its plane, along rail 22, so that it is clear of the axis of the nozzle 3, and the electronic component 4 may be lowered onto a printed circuit board 5.” (Emphasis added.)

Further, Tomita does not appear to teach or suggest that location coordinates of any object in any coordinate system are determined. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Tomita does not teach or suggest a computer configured to determine first location coordinates of an object in an image of the first camera in a first coordinate system, to determine second location coordinates of the object in an image from the second camera in a second coordinate system, and to determine a relationship between the first location coordinates and the second location coordinates. Therefore, Tomita does not teach or suggest

---

<sup>1</sup>See Brodsky, abstract.

<sup>2</sup>See the outstanding Office Action at page 3, lines 4-9.

<sup>3</sup>See Kawasaki, column 13, lines 36-40.

“a first wide field camera,” “a second narrow field camera,” **and** “a computer” as defined in Claim 11. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Brodsky does not teach or suggest these features either. Consequently, Claim 11 (and Claims 12-19 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita.

Claim 20 recites in part:

depositing objects, positioned on their reference face,  
on the tray;  
***displaying all the objects in wide field, with  
identification of each object with its position and its  
orientation;***  
***displaying an area to be machined in narrow field  
with high resolution, on one of the objects;*** and  
machining the object using a beam output from the  
laser source.

As noted above, Tomita only describes that ***only one*** of two imaging devices or cameras is used. Thus, at best the device described by Tomita displays an area in wide field ***or*** displays an area in narrow field. Therefore, Tomita does not teach or suggest a method including “displaying all the objects in wide field” **and** “displaying an area to be machined in narrow field with high resolution” as defined in Claim 20. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Brodsky does not teach or suggest these elements either. Consequently, Claim 20 is also patentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 16 as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita it further in view of Chiba, it is noted that Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 11, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Chiba does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Brodsky and Tomita. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 16 is patentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita it further in view of Chiba.

Application No. 10/518,532  
Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2007

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Philippe J.C. Signore  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 43,922  
Edward W. Tracy, Jr.  
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\ET\263673US\263673US-AMD8.13.08.DOC